

the merits of the SEC's claims that the Defendants misused municipal bond proceeds in violation of the federal securities laws and a likelihood of future violations by the Defendants.¹

3. The September 9 Motion also noted that Letke had neither filed a response to the SEC's motion for preliminary injunction nor filed a witness list for the preliminary injunction hearing by the required deadlines.

4. The September 9 Motion also noted that Letke had advised the SEC, in writing, that Letke would assert his Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination as to all questions relating to this lawsuit until otherwise advised by an attorney. *See* Ex. A to Docket Entry 51.

5. In the September 9 Motion, the SEC requested that the Court grant the SEC's motion for preliminary injunction as to Letke without a hearing because, based on Letke's failure to file a response to the SEC's motion for a preliminary injunction, his failure to disclose any witnesses he would call at a preliminary injunction hearing, and his assertion of the Fifth Amendment as to all questions relating to this lawsuit, he had indicated that he will not be able to provide any evidence at a hearing to contest the SEC's motion for preliminary injunction. *See In re Aimster Copyright Litig.*, 334 F.3d 643, 653-54 (7th Cir. 2003) (no hearing on preliminary injunction required unless there is an indication that the defendant will introduce evidence at a hearing to weaken the moving party's case) (citing *Ty v. GMA Accessories, Inc.*, 132 F.3d 1167, 1171 (7th Cir. 1997)); *Promatek Indus., Ltd. v. Equitrac Corp.*, 303 F.3d 808, 814 (7th Cir. 2002) (same).

6. At a September 16 status hearing, the SEC presented the September 9 Motion to the Court, pursuant to its Notice of Motion. Letke appeared at the status hearing and requested an extension of time to file a response to the SEC's motion for preliminary injunction. The

¹ The City of Harvey has indicated that it intends to attempt to obtain authority to make an offer to the SEC to settle this case. If the City of Harvey makes a settlement offer, the SEC's Commissioners will decide whether to accept the offer.

Court granted Letke's request, provided Letke until September 30 to file a response to the SEC's motion for preliminary injunction, and denied the September 9 Motion without prejudice.

7. Letke did not file a response to the SEC's motion for a preliminary injunction by the September 30 deadline. This is yet another indication that Letke will not be able to provide a defense to the SEC's motion for preliminary injunction at a hearing. Under these circumstances, proceeding with the scheduled December 2 hearing is unnecessary and would waste the resources of the Court, the parties, and non-party witnesses. Accordingly, the SEC renews its motion for entry of a preliminary injunction against Letke without a hearing.

WHEREFORE, the SEC respectfully requests that this Court grant the SEC's motion for a preliminary injunction without a hearing as to Defendant Letke and grant such other and further relief as this Court deems just.

Dated: October 7, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Eric M. Phillips

Eric M. Phillips

Eric A. Celauro

Sally J. Hewitt

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission

175 W. Jackson Blvd., Suite 900

Chicago, Illinois 60604

(312) 353-7390

*Attorneys for the Plaintiff, the United States Securities and
Exchange Commission*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Eric M. Phillips, an attorney, being duly sworn, state on oath that on October 7, 2014, I caused Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Entry of Preliminary Injunction Without a Hearing As To Defendant Joseph T. Letke and the Notice of Motion to be served upon the following by UPS, overnight delivery, and via email:

Joseph T. Letke (josephletke@yahoo.com)
20515 Abbey Drive
Frankfort, IL 60423

and upon the following counsel by the Court's CM/ECF system:

Tiffany Ferguson, Esq.
Rachel Steiner, Esq.
Attorneys for Defendant City of Harvey, Illinois

/s/ Eric M. Phillips
Eric M. Phillips